

<p>Item 6 17/00102/FUL</p> <p>Youth Opportunities Centre, Rocheway, Rochford</p>	<p>Contents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction to Report 2. Representation from the Occupier of 75 Somerset Avenue 3. Reply to Consultation: Natural England 4. Holding Objection Response Issued by Sports England 5. Amended Officer Recommendation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction to Report <p>The officer report indicated under point 1.26 that ‘the built form associated with phase 2 along its frontage with Rocheway will be set back 13 metres from the footway where 6 dwellings will be sited and served by shared frontage’. This should read as follows: ‘the built form associated with phase 1 along its frontage with Rocheway will be set back 13 metres from the footway where 6 dwellings will be sited and served by shared frontage.’</p> 2. Representation from the Occupier of 75 Somerset Avenue, Rochford <p>Objection based on noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Concerns raised that a full demolition would be quite disruptive to the surroundings. Surely an attractive historic building like this one would be a prime opportunity for residential development that keeps the outer structure mainly the same.</p> 3. Reply to Consultation: Natural England <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)</p>
--	--

	<p>Natural England's comments in relation to this application are provided in the following sections.</p> <p>Statutory Nature Conservation Sites – no objection.</p> <p>Natural England has assessed this application using the Impact Risk Zones data (IRZs). Natural England advises your authority that the proposal, if undertaken in strict accordance with the details submitted, is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which Crouch and Roach Estuaries (Mid Essex Coast Phase 3) SPA and RAMSAR and Essex Estuaries SAC have been classified. Natural England therefore advises that your Authority is not required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of this proposal on the site's conservation objectives.¹</p> <p>¹ This reply comprises our statutory consultation response under the provisions of Article 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, Regulation 61 (3) of the <i>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)</i>, (The Habitat Regulations) and Section 28(l) of the <i>Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)</i>.</p> <p>In addition, Natural England is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the Crouch and Roach Estuaries SSSI has been notified. We therefore advise your authority that this SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application. Should the details of this application change, Natural England draws your attention to Section 28(l) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), requiring your authority to re-consult Natural England.</p> <p>Protected Species</p> <p>We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species.</p> <p>You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response</p>
--	--

	<p>received from Natural England following consultation.</p> <p>The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence is needed (which is the developer's responsibility) or may be granted.</p> <p>If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us with details at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> <p>Local Sites If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g., Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website</p> <p>4. Holding Objection Response Issued by Sports England</p> <p>I would have to advise that based on the information provided it is likely that we will be objecting as a statutory consultee and that the application will need to be referred to the Secretary of State if the Council resolves to approve it as recommended.</p>
--	--

	<p>5. Amended Officer Recommendation</p> <p>In view of the response issued by Sports England, which indicates that it will be objecting to the planning application on the grounds that the application has not clearly demonstrated a sustainable parking solution in connection with the ongoing use of the sports pitches and designated open space - which would be subject to referral to the Secretary of State should the Council resolve to approve the development as currently proposed, the revised officer recommendation is that the decision be deferred, pending further clarity on this matter.</p>
<p>Item 7 17/00228/FUL</p> <p>289 Ferry Road, Hullbridge</p>	<p>Revised Site Layout Plan</p> <p>Subsequent to the publication of the report and the Members' site visit the applicant has submitted a revised site plan with changes to the areas of hard and soft landscaping.</p> <p>The revised site plan makes the following changes:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase in the number of parking spaces from 20 to 24 with 20 spaces provided to the front of the site and 4 spaces to the rear; ○ Rear four spaces to have grasscrete surface; ○ Relocation of cycle parking and bin store from front to rear of the building; ○ Reduction in size of private garden areas to flats A, B, C and D. The areas now associated with each flat are:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flat A - 26 square metres Flat B - 25 square metres Flat C - 81 square metres Flat D - 7 square metres ○ Increase in rear communal area from 403 to 555 square metres. This size exceeds the requirement for shared space for flatted developments. <p>All parking spaces meet the preferred bay size of 5.5m x 2.9m.</p> <p>The Recommendation remains approval, as previously set out in the report, subject to incorporating the revised layout into the approved list of plans.</p>

<p>Item 8 17/00502/FUL</p> <p>8 Harrow Close, Hawkwell</p>	<p>Contents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Letter from the Applicant 2. Email from the Applicant <p>1. Letter from the Applicant</p> <p>Since the publication of the report the following letter has been received from the applicant:-</p> <p>During a conversation with your office regarding the above works, mention was made that I would be required to provide an assessment of the impact of the project on local trees. My findings and assessment are detailed below.</p> <p>The site is located on the south east corner of the plot and is bordered at this junction by 65 Park Gardens, Hawkwell. A recent approval was given to the owner of 65 Park Gardens to carry out tree works, which entailed pruning of 4 mature oak trees, removal of one ash tree and pruning of a further ash tree. The site was visited by your staff; the above protection enquiry form confirms this. The remaining ash tree is the closest to the project and is around 8-10 metres south of it. I have planted an apple tree immediately to the north of the project – around 2-3 metres distant – however, this was planted after construction work began.</p> <p>The project is a play house and does not have running water or waste disposal. The intended use of the project (a play house for my children) will not generate any product considered harmful to the environment.</p> <p>Construction</p> <p>The play house is constructed on a slab at ground level. Other than immediate clearance of loose material at the surface, no digging was carried out and no root system for any tree was exposed. At the east side of the slab, it can clearly be seen to be raised. This raising of the side was necessary to account for the natural slope of the ground in enabling a level base to be constructed. The slab consists of a 100mm layer of waste brick and crushed concrete hard core, topped with a steel reinforced 50mm layer of OPC and sand/ballast concrete. The concrete was mixed</p>

	<p>on site using an electric mixer and no waste was introduced to the water table. The slab does not interfere with any water course.</p> <p>Above ground, the materials used for the construction are mainly C24 graded timbers. On the lower level, at the front and side aspects, the timbers are clad in construction graded OSB, covered with stainless mesh and will be rendered to give the appearance of natural stone. At the time of writing, construction is halted at the “scratch coat” stage. The rear aspect is covered with acrylic painted, treated feather edge boards.</p> <p>The front aspect will feature a bespoke pine door, treated in acrylic wood stain, along with two circular windows to be glazed with ballistic graded clear polycarbonate. These windows will sit in circular timber frames, treated with acrylic wood stain.</p> <p>The upper floor is clad at the sides with vertical treated timber planks (of a “ one raised, one recessed “ style) at 100mm intervals. It is intended to treat these planks with an acrylic wood stain to suit the general appearance of the project.</p> <p>The roof is covered with a layer of roofing paper, over which OSB boards are secured. It is intended to apply a layer of simple roofing felt over this, secured with felt adhesive and galvanised nails.</p> <p>The front aspect of the upper floor is mainly glazed and will consist of a bespoke pine door centrally, surrounded by ballistic graded clear polycarbonate panels. The polycarbonate will not be cut on site (other than for the anticipated very minor fitting adjustments), and will be produced in a purpose built factory unit.</p> <p>No materials used in the construction of the project are considered likely to have any adverse effect on the environment, in particular on any tree nearby.</p> <p>Tools and Machinery</p> <p>All tools used in the construction to date have been of either a hand held nature or of hand power tool size. There are no generators on site; all power is taken from the owner’s power supply. No fuel of any nature is being used, or is anticipated to be used, in either the construction or lighting of this project.</p>
--	--

	<p>No tools used in the construction of the project are considered likely to have any adverse effect on the environment, in particular on any tree nearby.</p> <p>Waste Management</p> <p>All waste material is being removed from site by the owner and taken to the Rayleigh recycling centre. There are no waste aggregates or OPC to dispose of; all materials are hand mixed on site to exact requirements.</p> <p>No waste produced to date in the construction of the project is considered likely to have any adverse effect on the environment, in particular on any tree nearby and has been fully recycled. There is no likelihood of producing any waste in the proposed future construction that is considered likely to impact on any nearby trees.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>There is no aspect of this construction, either in the method of the construction itself, materials (proposed or existing) or finish, that poses any risk to trees in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>2. Email from the Applicant</p> <p>In addition, the applicant has subsequently sent in the following email to the Council:-</p> <p>'I write with reference to planning application 17/00502 relating to 8 Harrow Close, Hawkwell, out building to rear of house for use as a play house. Would you please be kind enough to forward this note immediately to the planning department due to impending time constraints. I note that the report scheduled for the Development Committee on 20 July states that 'the neighbours at 7A Harrow Close object on the grounds of visual impact and proximity to the site boundary.' However, the actual letter from the occupants of 7A states only that they are concerned as to the impact on the occupant of No. 65 Park Gardens, with no comments in relation to any effect on their own property. Is it possible to address this in the report ahead of the meeting, as the implication from the report is that they are concerned about the effect on their own property?</p>
--	---

	<p>In addition, the comments from Number 7A Harrow Close were submitted on June 27, despite the fact that the planning documents state neighbour consultations were open until 22 June only. Could you please advise if there has been an extension to the consultation period and, if so, whether it is also open to other neighbours to submit their comments after the closing date listed on your website.'</p>
<p>Item 9(1) 17/00213/FUL</p> <p>Old Pumping Station, Fambridge Road, South Fambridge</p>	<p>Contents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reply to Consultation Essex County Council Flood and Water Management 2. Revised Officer Recommendation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reply to Consultation Essex County Council Flood and Water Management <p>Lead Local Flood Authority Position Having reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment and the associated documents which accompanied the planning application, we wish to issue a holding objection to the granting of planning permission based on the following:-</p> <p>Inadequate Surface Water Drainage Strategy The Drainage Strategy submitted with this application does not comply with the requirements set out in Essex County Council's Detailed Drainage Checklist. Therefore the submitted drainage strategy does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development.</p> <p>In particular, the submitted strategy fails to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Infiltration testing should be provided to demonstrate that infiltration via soakaway is feasible. ○ More detail needs to be submitted to show how the drainage scheme complies with local and national standards. It should be shown that an appropriate run off rate and storage provision has been chosen and supported by calculations. ○ Insufficient evidence to demonstrate suitable water quality treatment, as outlined in chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDs Manual C753.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ An indicative drainage plan should be provided to demonstrate the proposed location and sizing of all SuDs features. <p>However, In the event that more information was supplied by the applicants then the County Council may be in a position to withdraw its objection to the proposal once it has considered the additional clarification/details that are required.</p> <p>Any questions raised within this response should be directed to the applicant and the response should be provided to the LLFA for further consideration. If you are minded to approve the application contrary to this advice, we request that you contact us to allow further discussion and/or representations from us.</p> <p>2. Revised Officer Recommendation</p> <p>In view of the above reply to consultation received the REVISED OFFICER RECOMENDATION is to REFUSE for the reasons set out in the report and for the following additional reason for refusal:-</p> <p>2. The submitted drainage strategy does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development.</p> <p>In particular, the submitted strategy fails to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provide Infiltration testing to demonstrate that infiltration via soakaway is feasible.○ More detail needs to be submitted to show how the drainage scheme complies with local and national standards. It should be shown that an appropriate run off rate and storage provision has been chosen and supported by calculations.○ Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate suitable water quality treatment, as outlined in chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDs Manual C753.○ The submitted details fail to provide an indicative drainage plan to demonstrate the proposed location and sizing of all SuDs features.
--	--

	The absence of the above information prevents the Local Planning Authority being in a position to clearly assess if the proposal could give rise to increased surface water flooding in the locality.
--	---